

United States Patent and Trademark Office



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/072,742	02/06/2002	Mark R. Hansen	077077-9141-00	2995
23409	7590 11/09/2005		EXAMINER	
MICHAEL BEST & FRIEDRICH, LLP 100 E WISCONSIN AVENUE			SAFAIPOUR, HOUSHANG	
	E, WI 53202		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2627	

DATE MAILED: 11/09/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)			
Office Action Summary		10/072,742	HANSEN ET AL.			
		Examiner	Art Unit			
		Houshang Safaipour	2627			
Period for	- The MAILING DATE of this communication ap r Reply	opears on the cover sh	eet with the correspondence ac	idress		
A SHO WHIC - Extens after S - If NO - Failur Any re	DRTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPI HEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING I sions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1 SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period e to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statu sply received by the Office later than three months after the mailid d patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	DATE OF THIS COMN .136(a). In no event, however, d will apply and will expire SIX (tte, cause the application to bec	NUNICATION. may a reply be timely filed 6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this come ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status						
1)⊠ 2a)□ 3)□	Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>08</u> . This action is FINAL . 2b) The Since this application is in condition for allowed the practice under	is action is non-final. ance except for forma	· •	e merits is		
Disposition of Claims						
4) Claim(s) 1-9,11-14 and 18-20 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration. 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) 1-9,11-14 and 18-20 is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.						
Application Papers						
10) 🗌 7	The specification is objected to by the Examinate The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acception and applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction of the oath or declaration is objected to by the Example.	ccepted or b) object e drawing(s) be held in a ection is required if the dr	abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). awing(s) is objected to. See 37 C			
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.						
		•				
2) Notice 3) Inform	(s) of References Cited (PTO-892) of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) nation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08 No(s)/Mail Date	Pap B) 5) ☐ Noti	rview Summary (PTO-413) er No(s)/Mail Date ice of Informal Patent Application (PTo er:	O-152)		

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on September 8, 2005 has been entered.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's amendment filed on September 8, 2005 has been entered and made of record.

Applicant's arguments have been considered but they are moot in view of new grounds of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 9, 11, 18 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sikes et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,058,201) and further in view of Guha et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,750,466).

Regarding claim 1, Sikes et al. discloses a camera assembly of a printing press comprising:

Art Unit: 26227

a housing (46) that is movable by a transport system (motor 52); an image sensor (30) positioned within said housing and adapted to acquire images of a moving substrate of a printing press; a light source (40) positioned within said housing; an optics assembly (32) positioned within said housing (fig. 1, col. 6, lines 20-65). Although Sikes et al. discloses CPU and microprocessor for processing the images (col. 7, lines 63-67), Sikes does not disclose that the processing hardware is within the carriage. Guha in his Web Inspection system discloses a smart camera which in addition to scanning components includes pre-processor and image analyzer within a smart camera box. Therefore it would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art to combine Guha's smart camera with Sikes apparatus in order to have all components within the carriage as disclosed by Sikes. This combination would reduce the size of the apparatus and also reduces the volume of data because the web image data is processed inside the camera enclosure (Guha, col. 6, lines 64-66).

Regarding claim 2, Sikes et al. discloses the camera assembly of claim 1 wherein said image sensor is a CCD scanner (fig. 1, sensor 30).

Regarding claim 4, Sikes discloses a strobe light (fig. 1)

Regarding claim 5, Sikes et al. discloses the camera assembly of claim 1 wherein said optics assembly include a lens (fig. 1).

Regarding claim 9, Sikes et al. discloses the camera assembly of claim 1 and further including a communication interface (col. 7, lines 23-25).

Regarding claims 11 and 18, arguments analogous to those presented for claim 1 are applicable to claims 11 and 18.

Art Unit: 26227

Regarding claim 19, Sikes et al. discloses the camera assembly of claim 18 wherein said housing has a width dimension of no more than four inches (fig. 1).

Claims 3, 6, 7, 8, 12, 13, 14 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sikes et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,058,201).

Regarding claim 3, Sikes et al. does not explicitly discloses a camera assembly of claim 1 wherein said image sensor is an area scanner. The use of area scanner is well known and routinely implemented in scanning art as admitted by the applicant (Page 6, line 3). Therefore it would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include the use of area scanner in Sikes' system.

Regarding claim 7, Sikes et al. does not explicitly disclose the camera assembly of claim 1 wherein said image processing hardware includes at least one FPGA. The use of FPGA is well known and routinely implemented in scanning art (Official Notice). Therefore it would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include the use of FPGA in Sikes' system.

Regarding claim 8, although Sikes' et al. does not explicitly disclose the camera assembly of claim 1 and further including a power supply, power supply is the essential part of the assembly to provide power to the different instruments.

Regarding claims 12 and 13, arguments analogous to those presented for claims 1, 2 and 7 are applicable to claims 12 and 13.

Regarding claim 14, please refer to discussion under claim 1 and also col. 29 line 57 through col. 30 line 13.

Application/Control Number: 10/072,742 Page 5

Art Unit: 26227

Regarding claim 20, Sikes' et al. does not explicitly disclose a camera assembly to include at least one rib. Enclosures with ribs are well known and routinely implemented in scanning art (Official Notice). Therefore it would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include ribs in the enclosure assembly of Sikes' apparatus to improve heat dissipation.

Contact Information

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Houshang Safaipour whose telephone number is (571)272-7412. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon.-Thurs. from 6:30am to 5:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Edward L. Coles, Sr. can be reached on (571)272-7402. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

MECHIED DEVICENT

Houshang Safaipour Patent Examiner Art Unit 2627 November 4, 2005